

**MINUTES**  
**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
**September 12, 2007**  
**Michigan Townships Association Offices**  
**Lansing, Michigan**

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

**Present**

Carmine Palombo, Chairman	Howard Heidemann, Member
Robert Slattery Jr., Vice-Chairman	Steve Warren, Member
David Bee, Member	Rob Surber, Member
Jerry Richards, Member	Bill McEntee, Member
Kirk Steudle, Member	Susan Mortel, Member
Spencer Nebel, Member	

**Staff Present**

Rick Lilly- Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Patricia Hixson- Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Ron Vibbert- Bureau of Transportation Planning

**Absent**

Frank E. Kelley, Commission Advisor

**Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:09 P.M.

**Approval of July 11, 2007 Minutes - Rick Lilly**

Mr. Nebel moved for approval of the July 11, 2007 minutes, as presented. Supported by Mr. Richards. Motion approved.

**Correspondence and Announcements - Rick Lilly**

Mr. Lilly received a mailer from FHWA announcing that the second Asset Management webinar is coming up soon.

Tim Colling (from Michigan Local Technical Program) gave an update on training. Eleven meetings scheduled. He will attend all meetings. We just did the first two meetings one week ago. One was at Washtenaw and one at Saginaw County Road Commission's. Primarily we are getting township and county elected officials plus we've also had two state representatives send people as well. We have had a little bit over 50 people attending between the two of them. It's basically like a three hour short course on what is Asset Management and how does it affects you from an elected official's perspective. We're actually going to end up doing 11 training sessions this year. And we have a demand for more. We have a waiting list for 4-5 already, and people are calling all the time asking to get into this program. So it might be something that within next year's budget that we may want to increase training. We may want to increase that

up to 15, 16 or even more so. There really does seem to be a large demand for this class right now.

Jerry Richards showed the Council a copy of the township publication for Meridian Township. They are taking a very proactive approach for pavement preservation.

Mr. Palombo noted that at the last meeting the Council approved a budget for FY 2009. He asked Mr. Lilly if he could give an update on where that budget is. Mr. Slattery presented the budget to the State Transportation Commission in July and wowed them with a presentation. The Commission passed the budget and it was sent on to MDOT's finance staff for inclusion in the 2009 department's budget to be reviewed by the Department of Management and Budget. As far as where our 2008 budget sits we have no idea right now. Mr. Lilly did talk with Brad Williams from the Office of Government Affairs and there has still been no movement in the Senate Transportation Committee regarding the bill that was passed by the House to strengthen asset management.

Mr. Palombo requested an update on the conference planning. Mr. Lilly reported that there had been a meeting recently to talk about what the theme is going to be. It was suggested that we try to deal with the practical aspects of asset management bringing in more agencies that are actually doing asset management. The facilities are set. In Marquette we'll be at the same site that we were going to hold this year's meeting. Lansing's meeting will be at the Lansing Center downtown rather than the Kellogg Center. The program will focus dramatically on how agencies are doing asset management and we want to do a presentation on how you put together an asset management plan at the local level. We want to have a section in there on our reporting process and using the internet tool. So it will be a very practical conference and less theoretical than we've had in the past.

Mr. Palombo asked if there were any other correspondence or announcements. Mr. Heidemann reported that he had attended the Michigan Association of Counties committee meeting on transportation and suggested they find a replacement for him on this board. Don Disselkoen from Ottawa County has agreed. Mr. Lilly reported that he had received a call from Tim McGuire, Director of the Michigan Association of Counties informing him that MAC was recommending Commissioner Disselkoen. He is the chairperson of the Ottawa County Board of Commissioners and is a member of MAC's transportation committee. Mr. Lilly has provided him information already on members' names, addresses, emails etc.

Mr. Stuedle distributed material on an Asset Management Webinar that he and Carmine participated in the recent past, and there is another one like it to be held the week of September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2007. Anyone that is interested is encouraged to hook up and listen to the meeting. Mr. Stuedle asked whether members had received copies of the federal report on the national scan. Members indicated they received the report in the mail.

Mr. Palombo asked Mr. Steudle about the bridge situation in Michigan with comment about the situation that happened in Minnesota with the collapsed bridge. Mr. Steudle responded that it has certainly moved the attention towards funding of infrastructure. Mr. Steudle commented on a hearing in Washington DC where he testified about bridges and the funding for them. Mr. Lilly indicated that he had sent out copies of Mr. Steudle's testimony to the Council.

#### **Update on 2007 PASER Data Collection – Rob Surber**

Mr. Surber distributed a handout with an update on data collection. Thanks to Mr. Lilly for his emails that help to promote a few more responses. Thanks to the regions and MPOs who are helping to work with us to gather this information.

#### **Review of Potential Bridge Maintenance Training Program – Rick Lilly**

Mr. Lilly distributed handouts on the annual report and the recommendation made by the council regarding the local bridge program that the State Transportation Commission adopted as an initiative for the Council to encourage the implementation of capital preventive maintenance activities for bridges under local jurisdiction. Mr. Lilly presented a power point presentation from the Texas LTAP on bridge maintenance. This came to Terry McNinch and they passed it on to us to share. This could be modified for our use here in Michigan as a new tool. Staff is asking the Council to give us the direction to have Michigan Tech work with Dave Juntunen and his staff to develop such a class.

Mr. Richards had questions on what do we want to train for? Do we need to identify capital preventative maintenance or inspection itself so that local agencies are not and specific professionals would do this? What would be the purpose of this presentation either this one or one that we develop? Is it clear in everyone's mind of what we are trying to accomplish? Mr. Lilly stated we would want to show what the value of MDOT's preventive maintenance program has been in terms of the condition. And how our condition has improved by going to a more aggressive preventative maintenance. Also, educating everyone on the local bridge program and the availability of funding and that preventive maintenance is now an eligible expense.

**Mr. Williams moved that staff be directed to begin developing a class for local agencies regarding capital preventive maintenance for bridges. Mr. Nebel supported. Motion approved.**

#### **Discussion Regarding Compliance Issues with Project and Investment Reporting requirements – Data Management Committee**

The Data Management Committee met on August 27<sup>th</sup>. Mr. McEntee reported that the overall issue was the poor response rate on our requirement for reporting investments in the road systems of Michigan. Consensus was that all agencies need to be more aggressive in acquiring the information needed. Mr. McEntee turned it over the Rick Lilly for more detail. Mr. Lilly went over the handouts with the members. He then described some of the alternatives that could be undertaken to enhance compliance. These included a recommendation that we send a letter to the Chairperson of each

county road commission next year as well as the street administrators notifying them that it is time to report. We could dovetail our reporting requirements with the other reporting agencies. Follow-up phone calls should be made to make phone calls to obtain the information needed for compliance. If agencies do not comply, then funding should be withheld until the information is received. Another recommendation is that when we send out the initial letter, whether it is through an email and/or regular mail, that we send out a manual with details of what is needed. Also recommend that we have 5-6 training sessions next year on this process to educate more agencies.

Mr. Nebel strongly recommended that this all be made a part of the Act 51 reporting requirements. We would no doubt receive a better response from the agencies that have to report back to us. Mr. Lilly reported that the MDOT finance staff is beginning to do a re-engineering of their entire process. They are doing a requirements session on what they'll need within the next month or so. And the committee instructed the staff at CGI and our staff to work with them on building that single report. It was recommended that the two entities get together to see if these requirements would mesh or not. Ms. Mortel was concerned that such an effort would be very difficult because each group needs different information. We need to know more detail about projects and less detail about accounting. While we are waiting for the agencies to determine if this is doable, we need to be more aggressive in the short run in our collecting requirements.

Mr. Richards inquired as to when a final recommendation going to come to us? Mr. Lilly responded that the Data Management Committee will meet again this month. We will then come up with a recommendation to present to the Council.

Our next council meeting is October 3<sup>rd</sup> and on that date you can look for a recommendation that will come from the Data Management Committee that will have a proposed game plan. The next Data Management Committee meeting is September 26<sup>th</sup>.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 2:55 P.M.

---

Frank E. Kelley  
Commission Advisor